

REMARKS

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out the allowable subject matter of Claims 19-24 and 28.

2. It should be appreciated that Applicant has elected to amend Claims 1, 10 and 25 solely for the purpose of expediting the patent application process in a manner consistent with the PTO's Patent Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (9/8/00). In making such cancellations and amendments, Applicant has not and does not in any way narrow the scope of protection to which Applicant considers the invention herein to be entitled. Rather, Applicant reserves Applicant's right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

3. The specification is objected to on the ground that section headings appear bold and underlined throughout the specification. The Examiner withdrew the objection during an informal telephone conversation on July 23, 2004 after Applicant pointed out that there is no precedent for such a formal requirement and that the authority cited for the objection, 37 CFR § 1.77(b) imposes no requirements regarding font or typeface.

4. Claims 1-9, 25-27 and 29-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,484,177 ("Van Huben"). To distinguish the invention from the cited reference more thoroughly, Applicant amends Claim 1 to describe a step of "organizing said directory views into a hierarchy using only information concerning

said entries.” Support for the amendment is found in the specification at page 10, line 6 to page 13, line 2. Thus, a view constitutes one or more filters that allow the user to navigate the directory entries based only on attributes of the entries themselves without imposition of any additional layers.

In stark contrast, Van Huben classifies heterogeneous directory entries according to a generic schema (Figure 2) wherein actual attributes of the directory entries are mapped to generic virtual attributes: package, variance, level, file type and version (Col. 8, line 20 to line 56). The actual data repositories may then be accessed only through a virtual control repository (Figure 1). Thus, Van Huben only provides the functionality of organizing the views into a hierarchy by superimposing an independent schema, the PFVL paradigm, on the directory entries and providing access by routing queries through the virtual control repository. Applicant accordingly deems the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and all Claims depending therefrom to be overcome.

Regarding Claim 6: Claim 6 is found to be anticipated by Col 11, lines 23-30 and Col. 16, line 29-30 of Van Huben. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Col. 16, line 29-30 of Van Huben describes the LDAP requirement that a directory entry have an object class attribute. Col 11, lines 23-30 describes a series of transaction types, found in the control repository access layer for accessing the control repository. One of these transactions types is a filter. However, the control repository access layer is part of Van Huben’s data management service (Figure 1). Van Huben’s filter transaction is not a directory entry, it does not belong to a specific object class as described in 16, line 29-30, and it has nothing to do with the directory service itself. There is therefore no

teaching in Van Huben of "wherein each of said directory views belongs to a specific object class that contains a filter attribute, said filter attribute containing a filter that describes said views."

Regarding Claim 25: Claim 25 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 28, found to be allowable. Applicant therefore deems the rejection of Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) to be overcome.

5. Claims 10-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Huben in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0169767 ("Harvey"). As above, there is no teaching or suggestion in Van Huben of "wherein each of said directory views belongs to a specific object class that contains a filter attribute, said filter attribute containing a filter that describes said views," the subject matter of Claim 15. Nor has the Examiner pointed to any such teaching from Harvey. Accordingly, there is no such teaching or suggestion in the references, considered either separately or in combination. Claim 10 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 15. Accordingly, Applicant deems the rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and all Claims depending therefrom to be overcome.

6. Claims 21-23 have been amended to correct grammatical errors.

CONCLUSION

Therefore, there remain no outstanding matters, rendering the Claims allowable over the cited references. The Examiner is thus earnestly requested to allow the application to pass to issue as a United States Patent. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the application, he is urged to contact the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Florin Corie', with a stylized, flowing script.

Florin Corie

Reg. No. 46,244

Customer 22,862